DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW (i) IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE CASES AND APPOINT LEAD COUNSEL, AND (ii) IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING RULING BY THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Putnam Investment Management, LLC, Putnam Investments Trust, Marsh & McLennan Companies, Inc., Putnam Investment Funds, and the various named Putnam mutual funds (collectively, the "Putnam Defendants") respectfully submit this memorandum of law in opposition to Plaintiffs' motion to consolidate the above-captioned cases and to appoint lead counsel (the "Plaintiffs' Motion"), and in support of the Putnam Defendants' motion to stay the

Page 2 of 13

consolidate the above-captioned actions² and to appoint Cauley Geller Bowman & Rudman LLP and Bernstein Liebhard & Lifshitz, LLP as Co-Lead Counsel.

This Court should defer any decision on Plaintiffs' Motion and should stay all proceedings in the above-captioned cases pending a ruling by the Panel on the Putnam Defendants' MDL Petition, for a number of reasons. First, other plaintiffs who have moved to appoint lead plaintiff and approve lead counsel have voluntarily agreed to stay their motions until the MDL Panel rules. See Stipulation and [Proposed] Order for actions pending in this District (attached hereto as Exhibit A); the Southern District of New York (attached hereto as Exhibit B); and the Northern District of California (attached hereto as Exhibit C).

Second, the above-captioned actions share common questions of law and fact with other Related Actions. The above-captioned actions allege that the Putnam Defendants violated Section 34(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 and breached fiduciary duties purportedly owed to Plaintiffs. A number of other Related Actions also allege violations of the Investment Company Act, and at least five allege only such violations. Because the above-captioned

For the ease of the Court, the Putnam Defendants are responding as a group to plaintiff's Motion, as captioned. In so doing, the Putnam Defendants do not concede that each of them has been served with the complaint in each of the actions included in plaintiffs' caption.

The Putnam Defendants moved to stay decision on the derivative plaintiffs' motion. See Exhibit D (Defendants' Memorandum of Law (i) in Opposition to Motion by Derivative Plaintiffs to Consolidate Derivative Cases and Appoint Lead Counsel, and (ii) in Support of Defendants' Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Ruling by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation).

These include Zuber v. Putnam Investment Management, LLC, No. 03-CV-12175 (D. Mass.); <u>Dubin v. Putnam Investment Management, LLC</u>, No. 03-CV-12209 (D. Mass.); <u>Yameen v. Putnam Investment Management, LLC</u>, No. 03-CV-12222 (D. Mass.); <u>Casey v. Putnam Investment Management, LLC</u>, No. 03-CV-12273 (D. Mass.); and <u>Ioakim v.</u> (continued...)

actions, other pending Investment Company Act-related actions, and the other numerous suits pending against the Putnam Defendants all share common questions of fact and law,5 this Court should defer decision on the instant motion. The transferee court, once it has all of the cases before it, will be in the best position to consolidate cases, appoint lead counsel, and coordinate discovery and other pretrial proceedings.

Finally, while the Putnam Defendants have requested that all Related Actions be transferred to this District for coordination or consolidation, a small number of plaintiffs have asked that all cases against all mutual fund complexes be transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. See, e.g., Piliere Pl.'s Mem. in Opp. to Putnam Defs.' Mot. to Transfer, passim (attached hereto as Exhibit E). Given the possibility that all of the cases against the Putnam Defendants pending in this District could be transferred to another jurisdiction, any decision by this Court on the instant motion would be premature and would waste scarce judicial resources.

ARGUMENT

THE COURT SHOULD STAY PROCEEDINGS, INCLUDING PLAINTIFFS' INSTANT MOTION, PENDING THE RULING BY THE MDL PANEL

Plaintiffs request that this Court consolidate the above-captioned actions and any other subsequently-filed related actions. See Pls.' Mot. at 2-3; Proposed Pretrial Order No. 1 at 3-4. This Court should stay all proceedings in the actions, including plaintiffs' request to consolidate and to appoint lead counsel, pending a ruling by the MDL Panel.

4

^{(...}continued) Putnam Investment Management, LLC, No. 03-CV-12402 (D. Mass.).

Plaintiffs acknowledge as much by their service list, which includes counsel for other Related Actions pending in this and other districts.

I. Federal Courts Routinely Stay Actions Pending Rulings by the MDL Panel

Federal courts have the inherent power to stay the proceedings before them. See Rivers v. Walt Disney Co., 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997). In exercising this power, a "majority of [federal] courts have concluded that it is . . . appropriate to stay preliminary pretrial proceedings while a motion to transfer and consolidate is pending with the MDL Panel because of the judicial resources that are conserved." Id. at 1362; see also U.S. Bank, Nat'l Ass'n v. Royal Indem. Co., No. CIV.A.3:02-CV-0853-P, 2002 WL 31114069, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 23, 2002) (staying proceedings pending ruling by MDL Panel); Peckler v. Citigroup, Inc., No. 00-10055-REK (D. Mass June 28, 2000) (order granting stay of proceedings pending ruling by MDL Panel "as a prudential measure") (a copy of this Memorandum and Order is attached hereto as Exhibit F); Aikins v. Microsoft Corp., No. CIV.A.00-0242, 2000 WL 310391, at *1 (E.D. La. Mar. 24, 2000) (staying proceedings pending ruling by MDL Panel).

Courts favor stays pending rulings by the MDL Panel because the litigation of overlapping claims in multiple forums imposes undue costs on the litigants, wastes scarce judicial resources, and leads to duplicative and inconsistent results. See, e.g., U.S. Bank, 2002 WL 31114069, at *2 (granting stay because "[i]f the MDL Motion is granted, all of the Court's time, energy, and acquired knowledge regarding this action and its pretrial procedures will be wasted"). This is true even where, as in this case, defendants seek a stay after plaintiffs have filed a motion for some form of pretrial relief. For example, in Hertz Corp. v. Gator Corp., 250 F. Supp. 2d 421 (D.N.J. 2003), the court stayed the proceedings, including plaintiff's earlier-filed motion for a preliminary injunction, until the MDL Panel issued its ruling in order to prevent the waste of the court's time and resources that otherwise would have resulted. Id. at 428.

5

II. Any Decision on Plaintiffs' MotionShould Await the Ruling by the MDL Panel

Plaintiffs will not suffer any prejudice from staying the above-captioned actions until the Panel has ruled on the MDL Petition. Because any stay would remain in place only until the Panel rules, there should be no extended delay. See, e.g., Republic of Venezuela v. Philip Morris Cos., No. 99-0586-CIV, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22742, at *6 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 28, 1999) (holding that the "brief stay" pending the MDL Panel's decision would not prejudice plaintiff); see also Register v. Bayer Corp., No. Civ. A. 02-1013, 2002 WL 1585513, at *1 (E.D. La. July 16, 2002) (holding that plaintiff would not be prejudiced by a temporary stay until the MDL Panel's decision); Tench v. Jackson Nat'l Life Ins. Co., No. 99 C 5182, 1999 WL 1044923, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 12, 1999) (holding that plaintiff would suffer no prejudice by "stay . . . for only the limited period" until the MDL Panel ruled on the request to transfer); Portnoy v. Zenith Labs., No. 86-3512, 1987 WL 10236, at *1 (D.D.C. Apr. 21, 1987) (granting stay where plaintiffs would not be prejudiced by "a short-term stay"). There is no reason to expect that the Panel will not rule on the MDL Petition shortly after it hears argument on January 29.

In contrast, in the absence of a stay, the Putnam Defendants risk multiple proceedings on the same issues. Indeed, devoting time to the consolidation of these cases and other matters at this time would be a waste of scarce judicial resources, particularly when there are other similar actions pending against the same defendants, and when all of the Related Actions could be transferred to another district. Such circumstances greatly favor a stay, and the cases so recognize. See, e.g., Aikins, 2000 WL 310391, at *1 (reasoning that stay pending MDL Panel decision was warranted because defendant "would suffer a considerable hardship and inequity if forced to simultaneously litigate multiple suits in multiple courts" as well as "poten-

Processing, Inc., Civ. A. Nos. 92-1030, 92-1086, 1992 WL 102762, at *2 (E.D. Pa. May 7, 1992) ("The duplicative motion practice . . . demonstrate[s] that judicial economy and prejudice to the defendants weigh heavily in favor of the stay."); see also Rosenfeld v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co., Nos. 88 CIV. 2153, 88 CIV. 2252, 1988 WL 49065, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. May 12, 1988) (holding that stays pending decision by MDL Panel were "warranted . . . to further the underlying purposes of coordination of multidistrict litigation").

Plainly, given the sheer number of Related Actions, any brief pause in the proceedings here is greatly outweighed by the benefits of coordinated litigation of the Related Actions. Indeed, the stay of these cases, and eventual consolidation of all Related Actions, undoubtedly will facilitate a swifter resolution of all of the litigation. See Rosenfeld, 1988 WL 49065, at *2; see also In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine, Fenfluramine, Dexfenfluramine) Prods.

Liab. Litig., 990 F. Supp. 834, 836 (J.P.M.L. 1998) (noting "economies of scale" that all parties will gain from consolidation); In re Stirling Homex Corp. Sec. Litig., 405 F. Supp. 314, 316 (J.P.M.L. 1975) (noting that plaintiffs will "experience a net savings of time, effort and expenses" through consolidation).

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, any decision on Plaintiffs' Motion should be deferred and the above-captioned actions all should be stayed pending resolution of Putnam's MDL Petition.

REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(D), the Putnam Defendants respectfully request oral argument of this motion.

Dated:

January 22, 2004

Boston, Massachusetts

Of Counsel:

Seth M. Schwartz
Elizabeth A. Hellmann
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE
MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
Four Times Square
New York, New York 10036-6522
(212) 735-3000

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Carroll (BBO #554426)

James R. Carroll (BBO #554426 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM LLP

One Beacon Street Boston, Massachusetts 02108 (617) 573-4800

Counsel for Putnam Investments Trust and Putnam Investment Management, LLC

John D. Donovan, Jr. (BBO # 130950)

ROPES & GRAY LLP One International Place Boston, MA 02110 (617) 951-7000

Counsel for Putnam Investment Funds and the Various Named Putnam Mutual Funds

Stephen W. Greiner

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

on R. Carroll [m]

787 Seventh Avenue

New York, NY 10019-6099

(212) 728-8224

Counsel for Marsh & McLennan Companies, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, James R. Carroll, hereby certify that on January 22, 2004, I caused a true copy of the foregoing document to be served by first class mail, postage prepaid, upon counsel of record for each other party as indicated on the service list attached hereto.

Dated: January 22, 2004

Tames R. Carrol

SERVICE LIST

BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

Mark C. Grady Nancy Kaboolian ABBEY GARDY LLP 21 East 39th Street

New York, NY 10016

Jeffrey S. Abraham

ABRAHAM & ASSOCIATES

One Pennsylvania Plaza, Suite 1910 New York, NY 10119

Daniel A. Osborn

BEATIE & OSBORN LLP

521 Fifth Avenue, 34th Floor New York, NY 10175

Norman Berman

BERMAN DeVALERIO PEASE TABACCO BURT & PUCILLO

One Liberty Square Boston, MA 02109

Sandy A. Liebhard U. Seth Ottensoser Gregory M. Egelston

BERNSTEIN LIEBHARD & LIFSHITZ, LLP

10 East 40th Street New York, NY 10016

Andrew S. Friedman Francis J. Balint, Jr.

BONNETT FAIRBORN FRIEDMAN & BALINT, P.C.

2901 No. Central, Suite 1000 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Robert J. Bonsignore

BONSIGNORE & BREWER

23 Forest Street Medford, MA 02155

Klint Bruno

LAW OFFICES OF KLINT BRUNO

1131 Lake Street Oak Park, IL 60301

Samuel H. Rudman Robert M. Rothman David A. Rosenfeld Mario Alba, Jr.

CAULEY GELLER BOWMAN & RUDMAN, LLP

200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 406 Melville, NY 11747

Pamela S. Tikellis Robert J. Kriner, Jr.

CHIMICLES & TIKELLIS, LLP

One Rodney Square, 5th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801

Nicholas E. Chimicles Denis Davis Schwartzman Timothy N. Mathes

CHIMICLES & TIKELLIS, LLP

361 West Lancaster Avenue Haverford, PA 19041

Martin D. Chitwood Lauren D. Antonio

CHITWOOD & HARLEY

2300 Promenade II 1230 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30309 Catherine A. Torell

COHEN MILSTEIN HAUSFELD & TOLL, P.L.L.C.

150 East 52nd Street, 30th Floor New York, NY 10022

Steven J. Brooks Robert D. Hillman

DEUTSCH WILLIAMS BROOKS DeRENSIS & HOLLAND, PC

99 Summer Street, 13th Floor Boston, MA 02110

Michael P. Donovan

DONOVAN & SEARLES, LLC

1845 Walnut Street, Suite 1100 Philadelphia, PA 19103

John G. Emerson Scott E. Poynter

EMERSON & POYNTER LLP

P.O. Box 164810 Little Rock, AR 72216

Patricia Dallmann William B. Federman

FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD

120 North Robinson Avenue, Suite 2720

Oklahoma City, OK 73102

Peter Fischbein

LAW OFFICES OF PETER FISCHBEIN

777 Terrace Avenue, 5th Floor Hasbrouck Heights, NJ 07604 Frederick P. Furth
Henry A. Cirillo
Carolyn B. Burton
Michael S. Christina
THE FURTH FIRM LLP
225 Push Street 15th Floor

225 Bush Street, 15th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104

David Pastor Peter A. Lagorio GILMAN & PASTOR, LLP 999 Broadway, Suite 500 Saugus, MA 01906

Michael Goldberg

GLANCY & BINKOW LLP

1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 311 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Jonathan M. Plasse Christopher J. Keller

GOODKIND LABATON RUDOFF & SUCHAROW

100 Park Avenue, 12th Floor New York, NY 10017

John J. Roddy Elizabeth A. Ryan Gary E. Klein GRANT & RODDY

44 School Street, Suite 400 Boston, MA 02108

Robert S. Green Robert A. Jigargian John W. Pinette

GREEN & JIGARJIAN LLP 235 Pine Street, 15th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104

Thomas M. Sobol HAGENS BERMAN LLP 225 Franklin Street, 26th Floor Boston, MA 02110

Steve W. Berman HAGENS BERMAN LLP 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101

Marc S. Henzel LAW OFFICES OF MARC S. HENZEL

273 Montgomery Avenue, Suite 202 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004

Harry W. Jacobs **JACOBS LAW OFFICES** 500 East 77th Street, Suite 507 New York, NY 10021

David Jaroslawicz LAW OFFICES OF **JAROSLAWICZ & JAROS** 150 William Street New York, NY 10038

Dennis J. Johnson Jacob B. Perkinson Peter J. McDougall **JOHNSON & PERKINSON** 1690 Williston Road South Burlington, VT 05403

Frederic S. Fox Christine M. Fox Donald R. Hall KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 805 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor New York, NY 10022

Stephen M. Tillerey KOREIN TILLERY 10 Executive Woods Court Swansea, IL 62226

George A. Zeles KOREIN TILLERY 70 West Madison Street, Suite 660 Chicago, IL 60602

Eugene Barsh KOREIN TILLERY 701 Market Street, Suite 300 St. Louis, MO 63101

Alan L. Kovacs LAW OFFICE OF ALAN L. KOVACS 2001 Beacon Street, Suite 106 Boston, MA 02135

MALINA & WOLSON Lincoln Building 60 East 42nd Street New York, NY 10165

Melvyn I. Weiss Steven G. Schulman Peter E. Seidman Andrei V. Rado MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD **HYNES & LERACH, LLP** One Pennsylvania Plaza New York, NY 10119

John J. Stoia, Jr. Timothy G. Blood Susan Collyer William J. Doyle, II MILBERG WEISS BRSHAD HYNES & LERACH, LLP 401 B Street, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101

Nancy F. Gans

MOULTON & GANS

33 Broad Street, Suite 1100 Boston, MA 02109

Bruce G. Murphy

LAW OFFICES OF BRUCE G. MURPHY

265 Llwyds Lane Vera Beach, FL 32963

NAPOLI KAISER & BERN LLP

115 Broadway

New York, NY 10006

Klari Neuwelt

LAW OFFICE OF KLARI NEUWELT

110 East 59th Street, 29th Floor New York, NY 10022

Harold B. Obsteld

HAROLD B. OBSTELD, P.C.

260 Madison Avenue, 18th Floor New York, NY 10016

Charles Piven

LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES J. PIVEN, P.A.

The World Trade Center-Baltimore 401 East Pratt Street, Suite 2525 Baltimore, MD 21202

Brian P. Murray

Eric J. Belfi

RABIN MURRAY & FRANK LLP

275 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016 Garrett Blanchfield

REINHARDT WENDORF & BLANCHFIELD

332 Minnesota Street, Suite 1250

St. Paul, MN 55101

Stephen V. Saia

LAW OFFICE OF STEPHEN V.

SAIA

70 Old Cart Path Lane

Pembroke, MA 02359

Richard S. Schiffrin

Marc A. Topaz

Joseph H. Meltzer

Edward W. Ciolko

Edward W. Chang

SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY, LLP

Three Bala Plaza East, Suite 400

Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004

Joel P. Litman

Jay P. Saltzman

Frank R. Schirripa

SCHOENGOLD & SPORN, P.C.

19 Fulton Street, Suite 406

New York, NY 10038

William H. Shaheen

Lucy J. Karl

SHAHEEN & GORDON

Two Capital Plaza, Suite 4

Concord, NH 03302

Ralph M. Stone

Thomas G. Ciarlone, Jr.

SHALOV STONE & BONNER LLP

485 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1000

New York, NY 10018

Marc J. Ross

SICHENZIA ROSS FRIEDMAN FERENCE LLP

1065 Avenue of the Americas 21st Floor New York, NY 10018

Jeffrey L. Kodroff William G. Caldes

SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.

1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Joseph H. Weiss Richard Acocelli James E. Tullman

WEISS & YOURMAN

One Pennsylvania Plaza New York, NY 10176

Aaron L. Brody Jules Brody STULL, STULL & BRODY 6 East 45th Street, 5th Floor New York, NY 10017

Richard J. Vita

LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD J. VITA, P.C.

77 Franklin Street Suite 300 Boston, MA 02110

Robert I. Harwood Matthew M. Houston WECHSLER HARWOOD HALEBIAN & FEFFER LLP 488 Madison Avenue 8th Floor New York, NY 10022 Daniel W. Krasner Fred T. Isquith Mark C. Rifkin Robert Abrams Christopher S. Hinton

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP

270 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016

Andrew E. Lencyk
Chet B. Waldman
Marian P. Rosner
Michael A. Schwartz
WOLF POPPER LLP
845 Third Avenue, 12th floor
New York, NY 10022

Alfred G.Yates

LAW OFFICES OF ALFRED G. YATES

519 Allegheny Building 429 Forbes Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Eduard Korsinsky **ZIMMERMAN, LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP**39 Broadway, Suite 1440
New York, NY 10006

Jean-Marc Zimmerman
ZIMMERMAN, LEVI &
KORSINSKY LLP
226 St. Paul Street
Westfield, NJ 07090

Jeffrey P. Maletta
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

John Sylvia
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS
GLOVSKY & PEPEO, PC
One Financial Center, 40th Floor
Boston, MA 02111

John D. Gilmore
PIPER RUDNICK LLP
100 Oliver Street, 21st Floor
Boston, MA 02110

John D. Donovan, Jr. Richard D. Batchelder, Jr. ROPES & GRAY One International Place Boston, MA 02110

Samuel H. Rudman
David A. Rosenfeld
Mario Alba Jr.
CAULEY GELLER BOWMAN &
RUDMAN LLP
200 Broadhollow Road, Suite 406
Melville, NY 11747

David Pastor
GILMAN AND PASTOR, LLP
Stonehill Corporate Center
999 Broadway, Suite 500
Saugus, MA 01906

Sandy A. Liebhard
U. Seth Ottensoser
Gregory M. Egleston
BERNSTEIN LIEBHARD &
LIFSHITZ, LLP
10 East 40th Street
New York, NY 10016

Stephen W. Greiner
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER
LLP
787 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Page 13 of 13